REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The rejections presented in the Office Action dated April 15, 2009 (hereinafter Office Action) have been considered. Claims 1-13, 17, and 19-38 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration of the pending claims and allowance of the application in view of the present response is respectfully requested.

1.   Claims 1-6 are rejected based on 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2004/0045004 by Cheenath (hereinafter "Cheenath") and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0088421 by Maes et al. (hereinafter "Maes").

The Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as previously presented are not rendered obvious in view of the combination of Cheenath and Maes. However, in order to facilitate prosecution of the application and in a *bona fide* attempt to advance the application to allowance, the Applicants present this response with amendment to clarify particular aspects of the claimed invention. These amendments make more clear what is believed to have been originally set forth in these claims, but now states so more specifically.

Specifically, independent Claim 1 has been amended to recite that a reduced message is formed at a first network entity based on at least an unreduced representation of a variant portion of a Web service message and a reduced representation of an invariant portion of the Web service message. The variant portion changes for repeated invocations of a remote procedure call and an invariant portion does not change for the repeated invocations of the remote procedure call. The reduced message is sent to invoke the remote procedure call. These amendments are fully supported in the Application as filed (e.g., FIGS. 2-3 and Specification at 0040) and no new matter has been added.

In the Office Action, Cheenath is relied upon to show determining a variant portion and invariant portion of a Web service message. The Examiner recognizes at page 3 of the Office Action that Cheenath fails to disclose forming a reduced message, and thus relies upon Maes to purportedly show reducing the size of the messages taught by Cheenath. As Applicants have previously noted, Cheenath provides no express teaching of determining a variant portion that changes for repeated invocations of the remote procedure call and an invariant portion that does not change for the repeated invocations of the remote procedure call. The Examiner cites

10

paragraphs 0017 and 0021 of Cheenath to support this contention, stating that "parameters can change, data structure remains the same from the WSDL file." (Office Action, page 3). However, Cheenath merely describes the use of a WSDL file and Java introspection to automatically construct a SOAP message, but nowhere in paragraph 0021 or elsewhere suggests which portions, if any, of the SOAP envelope, body elements, and parameters may be considered variant or invariant.

Maes does not teach or suggest any recognition of variant and invariant portions of Web service messages, nor is this alleged in the Office Action. As the Office Action succinctly states, Maes "discloses reducing the size of the messages by using XML RPC or lighter weight messages. [Maes, paragraph 130]" (Office Action, page 4). Thus the combination of Cheenath with Maes merely suggests forming messages using an alternate protocol such as XML RPC, and does not teach or suggest forming reduced messages within the SOAP or XML RPC protocols themselves. The combination of the XML RPC messages taught in Maes with the teachings of Cheenath fails to correspond at least to Claim 1, as previously presented and particularly as amended.

In particular, the combination of Cheenath and Maes fails to teach or suggest forming a reduced message based on a reduced representation of an invariant portion of a Web service message along with the variant portion. While not acquiescing that the combination of Cheenath and Maes recognizes forming reduced messages, or that the combination recognizes any distinction based on variant or invariant portions of Web service messages, this combination of references clearly fails to teach or suggest reducing an invariant portion to form a reduced message that also includes a variant portion that is unreduced. Accordingly, Claim 1 is allowable over the combination of Cheenath and Maes. Claims 5-6 are also allowable over this combination of references at least because of their dependence from Claim 1. "If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. §103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious." M.P.E.P. §2143.03; citing *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

2.   Claims 7-34 are rejected based on 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheenath and Maes as applied to claim 1 and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0204645 by Sharma et al. (hereinafter "Sharma").

11

Applicants first note that the rejections of Claims 14-16 and 18 are moot in view of the cancellation of these claims without prejudice or disclaimer.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 7-12, these claims all depend from Claim 1, which was rejected as obvious in view of the combination of Cheenath and Maes. Sharma was also cited in the rejection of independent Claims 13, 17, 21, 23, 27, and 30, although no specific portions of Sharma were cited in the rejection of the independent claims. For example, page 6 of the Office Action merely states that "Claims 13-14 are substantially the same as claims 1-12 and are therefore rejected for the same reason." While not acquiescing to this statement, Applicants note that Sharma was not relied upon to cure the deficiencies of Cheenath and Maes as applied to Claim 1. Further, Sharma fails to teach or suggest, e.g., a reduced message formed based on an unreduced representation of a variant portion of a Web service message and a reduced representation of an invariant portion of the Web service message. As a result, the combination of Cheenath, Maes, and Sharma fails to teach or suggest these features. Therefore Claims 7-13, 17, and 19-34 are allowable over the cited combination of references.

Finally, Applicants note newly added dependent Claims 35-38. These claims are fully supported in the Application as filed (e.g., Claim 21 as previously presented and Claims 3-5 as originally filed) and no new matter has been added. These claims are allowable over the cited combinations of references at least because they directly or indirectly depend from Claim 21. Thus entry and allowance of Claims 35-38 is respectfully solicited.

Authorization is given to charge Deposit Account No. 50-3581 (NOKM.059PA) any necessary fees for this filing. If the Examiner believes it necessary or helpful, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss any issues related to this case.

Respectfully submitted,

HOLLINGSWORTH & FUNK, LLC
8009 34th Avenue South, Suite 125
Minneapolis, MN 55425
952.854.2700

Date: October 14, 2009   By: /William B. Ashley/

William B. Ashley
Reg. No. 51,419

12